REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated July 9, 2008, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on October 9, 2008. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

In the specification, the paragraph [0054] has been amended to correct minor editorial problems.

Claims 1-4, 7-25 and 28-47 are pending in the application. Claims 1-4 and 7-21 remain pending following entry of this response. Claims 22-25 and 28-47 have been cancelled.

Further, Applicants are not conceding in this application that those canceled claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as the present claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of the claimed subject matter. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue these canceled claims and other claims in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications.

Interview Summary

On August 19, 2008, a telephonic interview was held between John C. Garza, Applicants' representative, and Examiner Jordany Nunez. The parties discussed the cited references including *Cox and Baudel*. Claim 1 was discussed.

During the interview, Applicants argued that the references do not teach all of the limitations of the present claims. No agreement could be reached at the time of the interview.

Claim Objections

Claims 43-47 stand objected to because they recite the informality "one processor a memory."

Claims 43-47 have been canceled for reasons not related to this rejection. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-4, 7-9, 11-17, and 19-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pub. No. US 2002/0156806 of *Cox et al.* (hereinafter "*Cox*") in view of US patent No. 6,928,436 issued to *Baudel* (hereinafter "*Baudel*").

Claims 10 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Cox* in view *Baudel*, and further in view of US patent No. 7,027,056 issued to *Koselj et al* (hereinafter "*Koselj*").

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Examiner bears the initial burden of establishing a prima facie case of obviousness. See MPEP § 2141. Establishing a prima facie case of obviousness begins with first resolving the factual inquiries of Graham v. John Deere Co. 383 U.S. 1 (1966). The factual inquiries are as follows:

(A) determining the scope and content of the prior art;

(B) ascertaining the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art;

(C) resolving the level of ordinary skill in the art; and

(D) considering any objective indicia of nonobviousness.

Once the Graham factual inquiries are resolved, the Examiner must determine whether the claimed invention would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Respectfully, Applicants submit that the Examiner has not properly characterized the teachings of the references and/or the claims at issue. Accordingly, a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established.

With regards to independent claim 1, the Examiner asserts that the claim limitations are disclosed by *Cox*. However, the Examiner correctly acknowledges:

> Cox fails to specifically show: the transformation rules being specific to a different graphics rendering language, whereby the transformation rules support a plurality of graphics rendering languages; and transforming the abstract data structure into a plurality of concrete data structures, each concrete data structure corresponding to a different graphics rendering language.

See *Office Action*, page 4. Thus, the Examiner proposes to combine *Baudel* with *Cox* in order to teach the limitations at issue. More specifically, the Examiner states:

> In the same field of invention, Baudel teaches: a method for graphically rendering information of a database. Baudel further teaches: a visualization of information stored in a database (col. 1, l. 7-13), a visualization of a data table being a program that given as input any instance of a data table, outputs a uniquely defined sequence of graphic language instructions (col. 3, l. 48-50), a graphic language being a set of programming language functions and data types that enable describing images on a computer screen, examples of which OpenGL, Poscript, Java3D (col. 3, lines 22-29), and a DECORATION process setting graphic attributes for each record being drawn, said attributes including certain illumination models described in languages such as OpenGL and Java3D (i.e., because this process sets graphics attributes in languages such as OpenGL and Java3D, the visualization described inherently may be output in those languages).
>
> Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Cox and Baudel at the time that the invention was made, to have combined the visualization of information stored in a database, a visualization of a data table being a program that given as input any instance of a data table, outputs a uniquely defined

> sequence of graphic language instructions, a graphic
> language being a set of programming language functions
> and data types that enable describing images on a computer
> screen, examples of which OpenGL, Poscript, Java3D, and
> a DECORATION process setting graphic attributes for each
> record being drawn, said attributes including certain
> illumination models described in languages such as OpenGL
> and Java3D of Baudel with the method as taught by Cox.

See *Office Action*, page 5. Referring to the material cited by the Examiner, *Baudel*, col. 1, lines 7-13 describes the field of the invention, and *Baudel*, col. 3, lines 22-29, 48-50 provide definitions of terminology used in *Baudel*, namely the terms "Graphic Language" and "Visualization." These definitions are apparently cited because they include the expressions "graphic languages" and "graphic language instructions."

Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's argument is flawed, as it fails to explain how the cited portions of *Baudel* are related to the present claims. In fact, Applicants point out that the Examiner's argument (quoted above from *Office Action*, page 5) does not even include the limitations at issue. For example, the Examiner argues "a DECORATION process setting graphic attributes for each record being drawn, said attributes including certain illumination models described in languages such as OpenGL and Java3D." However, the Examiner's argument fails to explain how any of these elements of *Baudel* (i.e., DECORATION process, graphic attributes, illumination models, etc.) can be analogized to the limitations at issue. Further, the Examiner fails to provide any basis or citation for this statement. Applicants respectfully submit that, on this basis alone, the Examiner has not properly established a prima facie case of obviousness.

Additionally, Applicants submit that *Baudel* as a whole fails to teach any of the limitations that the Examiner correctly acknowledges as not being disclosed by *Cox*. For example, *Baudel* fails to teach *transforming the abstract data structure into a plurality of concrete data structures, each concrete data structure corresponding to a different graphics rendering language*, as recited in claim 19. That is, while *Baudel* coincidentally describes various "graphic languages" (*Baudel*, col. 3, lines 22-29, as

cited by the Examiner), *Baudel* does not teach any sort of transformation that results in a <u>plurality of data structures that **each** correspond to a **different** graphics rendering language</u>. Further, *Baudel* does not teach any sort of transformation rules, much less *providing transformation rules for transforming the abstract data structure into a concrete data structure, the transformation rules comprising a plurality of subsets of transformation rules each subset describing graphical attributes of a requested graphical representation type and being specific to a different graphics rendering language*, as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, claims 1-4, 7-9, 11-17, and 19-21 are believed to be allowable, and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

In rejecting claims 10 and 18, the Examiner relies on *Cox* in view *Baudel* as applied to the claims discussed above. Therefore, for the reasons provided above with respect to claims discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection is obviated. Therefore, claims 10 and 18 are believed to be allowable, and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted, and
S-signed pursuant to 37 CFR 1.4,

/Gero G. McClellan, Reg. No. 44,227/

Gero G. McClellan
Registration No. 44,227
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd., Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicants